



THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC

Quarterly Gazette of the
Anglican Society.

Vol. 13.

No. 45.

Spring, 1941.

CONTENTS.

REUNION NOTES

Part of the NEWS SHEET of our American Branch.

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC

THE ARMS OF CROMWELL

THE DRAMA OF THE SANCTUARY—SUGGESTIONS FOR MEDITATIONS.

THE YEAR'S WORK IN THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY—

Report by E. G. P. Wyatt

HON. TREASURER'S NOTES—EDITORIAL NOTES

Rev. Dr. C. B. Moss

Rev. Louis E. Daniels

A. E. Greening Lamborn

PRICE SIXPENCE.

The Anglican Society.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE :

- 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer.
 - 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.
-

President :

THE REVD. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.

General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer :

THE REVD. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.

Editor :

THE REVD. A.W BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.

Diocesan Organizing Secretaries :

BRISTOL.

M. H. N. CUTHBERT-ATCHLEY,
9 Apsley Road, Esq.,
Clifton, Bristol.

CARLISLE.

THE REVD. K. F. MORRIS,
Ennerdale Vicarage,
Cleaton, Cumberland.

CHICHESTER.

THE REVD.
G. HENNIKER-GOTLEY,
Wivelsfield Vicarage,
Hayward's Heath, Sussex.

DERBY.

THE REVD. R. F. BOROUGH,
Bradburne Vicarage, Ashbourne,
Derbys.

ELY.

THE REVD. G. H. HARRIS,
South View, Pier Avenue, Southwold,
Suffolk.

GUILDFORD.

THE REVD. G. O. APTHORP,
Braidley, Wrecclesham,
Farnham, Surrey.

LONDON.

THE REVD. E. A. MARRIOTT,
St. Peter's Vicarage, 29 Heath Road,
Harrow, Middlesex.

NORWICH.

THE REVD. C. E. POCKNEE,
Faverham Rectory, Norwich.

OXFORD.

THE REVD. J. E. BOWLES,
11 S. Peter's Hill, Caversham, Reading.

TRURO.

THE REVD. J. L. KEMPTHORNE,
St. Enoder Rectory, Summercourt.

WAKEFIELD.

THE REVD. W. E. NORRIS,
St. John's Vicarage, Huddersfield.

AMERICA.

THE REVD. F. T. E. BLAKE,
1625 Locust Street,
Philadelphia.

All who are in sympathy with the objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary at the above address. The annual subscription for members is three shillings and sixpence, which includes the subscription to the "English Catholic" (2/-).

THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

SPRING, 1941.

Vol. 13. No. 45

HON. TREASURER'S NOTES.

May I once more make an appeal for the prompt payment of subscriptions? So far in response to the reminders enclosed in the last issue of the *Quarterly* I have received replies from rather less than 50 % of the members. It would relieve my mind of considerable anxiety if those members who

have not yet paid their subscriptions for 1941 would straightway send a cheque or postal order for 3/6 (or more) addressed to

The Rev. G. B. TIMMS,
341 London Road,
Reading, Berks.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

WALTER HOWARD FRERE. A collection of his papers on Liturgical and Historical subjects. Edited by J. H. Arnold and E. G. P. Wyatt, with an Introduction by A. S. Duncan-Jones and a Foreword by E. K. Talbot, C.R. [For the Alcuin Club: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 10/6.]

Most of our readers will agree that Walter Frere ranked amongst the best and the greatest of our Bishops; and he was unique in the fact that he was a Religious during his episcopacy, for upon becoming a Bishop he maintained his allegiance to the Community of the Resurrection. Frere was a man of charming personality, a sincere Christian, and a scholar in the true sense of the word. His books, "A New History of the Book of Common Prayer," "The Principles of Religious Ceremonial," the part he played in the revision of the Prayer Book, and his work at Truro, stamp him as a master liturgiologist without equal or rival. He contributed many excellent articles to such publications as the *Church Quarterly Review*, the *Journal of Theological Studies*, and the *Truro Diocesan Gazette*, and the Alcuin Club deserves to be congratulated upon their collection of Frere's papers because many important articles are now preserved in book form and saved to posterity. It is a book of nearly 250 pages; with a reproduction of Harold Knight's picture of the Bishop, and a facsimile from his diary of Prayer Book revision.

The Contents are: The Place of the Papacy in the organization of Christian Unity. Edwardine vernacular Services before the First Prayer Book. The newly-found York Gradual. The connexion between English and Norman Rites. Lollardy

and the Reformation. The Use of Exeter. The Reconstruction of Worship. The Palaeography of early Mediaeval Music. The English Rite. The new South African Liturgy. Gloria in Excelsis. The end of the Celebration of Holy Communion. The Oblations. The Christian Altar. York Service Books. Reservation in Elizabethan Days. The New Consecration Prayer. The Authority for Reservation. Funerals. Collects, good and bad. Climax and Anticlimax. The pace of Responses. Early Franciscan Influence on Religious Services. The Anaphora: The English Rite 1549—1927. Appendices: Facsimile and Transcription of Note by Dr. Frere on Dr. Brightman's attitude to the Canon of 1928. The 1928 Canon in Latin. Extract from Letter to Rev Canon A. G. Robinson Scheme of Choir Offices drawn up by Dr. Frere for a Sisterhood. Bibliography.

Part of the *News Sheet* of our American Branch is printed in this number; and in connection with the report of the exhibition at the General Convention, an architect member of the Anglican Society has received a letter of thanks for the photographs which he loaned to the exhibition. Selected paragraphs from this letter are printed herewith for the information of our readers:—

"My exhibit at Kansas City came off very well. I may say truthfully that your photographs were the feature of it. My booth (one of about 100 in the Exhibition Hall) was ten feet square, open in front, and enclosed by ply-board walls about seven feet high. Your photographs, along with some others, were displayed upon these walls; they had plenty of space around them and each one had a descriptive label. At the back, standing upon a table was an

excellent small model of a proper English Altar. Below were tables provided with literature, and some comfortable chairs. The color scheme was quiet (light and dark blue) and the booth was really one of the most attractive in the whole exhibition. My visitors' book has over 400 names and addresses, and quite as many more who came in were unregistered.

We attracted much attention and I believe that the Anglican Society gained greatly through the exhibit. Your photographs are reposing here in my house, and I am writing to ask if you desire immediate return. I would like very much to show them at the Annual Meeting in New York in January.

With hearty thanks and very kind regards, I am, very faithfully yours,

LOUIS E DANIELS."

Christ Church, Oberlin, Ohio.

The American Branch has published an excellent booklet, "The Ornaments Rubric: its history and force," by Canon Louis E.

Daniels. Now, there are many worthy churchpeople who quite rightly expect the Church of Christ in England to be loyal to the Prayer Book. Many of these good people will attend a Sung Eucharist where the Priest wears Vestments of the English-shape, and conducts the Service in accordance with the two objects of the Anglican Society, but how many of them know upon what authority these things are done? How many could explain the whys and wherefores to a Sunday School class of senior children? This booklet provides the answer with sound information upon, and practical application of the title of its contents. We congratulate our American Branch upon its publication, and reprint it in this number for the consideration of all our readers.

Many of our readers are interested in the question of Reunion, and their attention is drawn to H. Burn-Murdoch's booklet, "Presbytery and Apostolic Succession," published by the S.C.M. Press, 1/-. (See "Reunion Notes.")

REUNION NOTES.

The last number (Dec. 1940) of the Swiss Old Catholic quarterly, "Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift," contains a great mass of information about the Orthodox Churches in all parts of the world. I have no means of testing this information; and some of it may soon become obsolete, through changes in Europe which may take place at any moment. Most of it is very little known in this country. According to this account, the Orthodox Church in Soviet Russia becomes bolder and bolder; there are still twenty-four churches open in Moscow, besides many prayer-rooms, and many boys leave the Consomol (Communist scouts) because they have become Christians; in new cities the Liturgy is celebrated in private houses (there being naturally no churches).

In Manchuria fifty or sixty Chinese and Japanese converts join the Orthodox Church every year, and two new churches have been built lately. The Orthodox diocese of Peking includes seventeen parishes and four convents. Orthodox parishes have been established in Batavia and other places in the Dutch East Indies, for Russians and Greeks. In February 1940, a new Orthodox church was consecrated at Oslo: the congregation had formerly used a Lutheran chapel.

The Orthodox Church in German Poland has been placed under Archbishop Seraphim of Berlin. (It is well known, that the German Government favours the Orthodox Church, as a possible instrument for future political plans, while keeping her, of course, well under the influence of its own ideas, as far as possible.) The Ukrainians in Poland are said to have formed a separate organization, and asked for the use of the cathedral at Warsaw, to the consternation of the other Orthodox. The new regime in the Polish Orthodox Church (which consists almost entirely of Russians of various kinds, the Poles being mostly Roman Catholics), has not been recognized by the Orthodox Patriarchates or by the Karlovtsi Synod of the Russian Church in exile. Archbishop Dionysius, formerly head of the Orthodox Church in Poland, has been put in charge of the Orthodox in a district in the Carpathians, by the German Governor-General of Poland, (according to the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.")

It is clear that the international difficulties of the Orthodox Church, which were great enough before the war, have now become greater through the confused state of Eastern Europe, and through the seizure of so many territories by the U.S.S.R.

The annexation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia, which may easily be forgotten, has been followed by severe persecution. The Baptism of infants is forbidden: religious teaching in the schools is abolished, and the Name of God is not allowed to be mentioned: the theological faculties have been closed, and anti-religious exhibitions have been much advertized; the churches have been deprived of their property, and the clergy are forbidden either to receive pensions or to insure their lives. Nevertheless, those of the churches which remain open are better attended than before.

The English Church had shortly before the war made an agreement with the Lutheran Churches of Latvia and Esthonia similar to that made with the Church of Finland. Our relations with the Orthodox Church in these countries was also close, as we may see by that charming book, "An Anglican in Esthonia," (published by the Faith Press). Lithuania is an almost completely Roman Catholic country, and we may be sure that the same persecution is being carried on there also.

I have received a very valuable pamphlet, entitled "Presbytery and Apostolic Succession," by Dr. H. Burn-Murdoch, which states the different views of "presbyteral succession" taken by Presbyterians: it is published by the Student Christian Movement for the "Friends of Reunion," and should correct much loose thinking.

It is becoming clearer and clearer to me that discussions about validity of orders are sheer waste of time, unless agreement on the doctrine of orders has first been reached. The attempt of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 to bring about union on the basis of the acceptance of episcopal orders as a fact, without raising any question of doctrine, was too characteristically English to win success in the world at large: and may now be regarded as definitely a failure.

All disagreement about orders is really disagreement about the doctrine of orders. Rome would not have ventured to deny the validity of our orders if our orthodoxy (in the Roman sense) as to the priesthood had been beyond question. The Orthodox would never have doubted our orders if we had said, officially and unreservedly, that we regarded ordination as a sacrament. The real obstacle to union between us and the Presbyterians is that we believe that the universal Church is visible, and that its

ministry is a priesthood, whereas they believe that the universal Church is invisible, and that the ministry is not a priesthood but a "preacherhood": it is a difference of doctrine, not of order. I cannot think of any two communions which are separated *only* by the fact that one does not recognize the other's ministry. If there were such a case, the one whose ministry was doubted ought to submit to conditional ordination.

The opinion which I had formed, and which was confirmed by Dr. Ainslie's book, that the Presbyterians mean by the universal Church the invisible company of the elect, is supported by Dr. Fairbairn's chapter on Calvinism in the "Cambridge Modern History" (vol. 2, ch. 11). This appears to explain the sense in which the Presbyterians claim continuity from the Apostolic Church. It is not a continuity of external organization; it is a continuity of the secret company of the faithful which has never failed even in the worst times. There is an important truth in this view; but it is not what we mean by continuity. Nothing but confusion can result if we fail to recognize that what the Presbyterians mean by "church," "continuity," "presbyter," "communion" is something different from what we mean by those words.

My opposition to the Week of Prayer for Unity seems to me to have been fully justified by the extraordinary sermon preached at the "central service" of that week, and published in both the "Church Times," and the "Guardian." We feel the utmost sympathy with our fellow-Christians of the Roman Communion who are suffering persecution in Germany and Poland, and we are glad to co-operate with the Roman Communion in any way allowed by our principles, (though its perpetual proselytizing makes cooperation both difficult and dangerous). But we cannot pray for reunion so long as the papal supremacy and the false doctrines of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican are its conditions: reunion on those terms is not a dream, but a nightmare.

We all want peace with Germany, but peace is impossible till the Nazi Government and the Nazi spirit are abolished: we all want peace with Latin Christendom, as our bishops have said, but not till the papal supremacy and the ultramontane spirit are abolished: and they cannot be abolished till there is something to put in their place.

C. B. Moss.

FROM THE DEC. 1940 NEWS SHEET OF THE AMERICAN BRANCH OF THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY.

OUR BOOTH AND SERVICE AT THE GENERAL CONVENTION.

The Anglican Society had a booth in the Hall of Exhibits through the whole period of the General Convention. It was in charge of Canon Daniels, who went to Kansas City expressly for the purpose of organizing and carrying on the booth. The splendid auditorium there includes a vast exhibition hall, and this was completely filled with exhibits from the various Church organizations and industries. We were well located, with the Cowley Fathers on one side, the St. Hilda Guild on the other, and the American Church Union opposite. The location of the St. Hilda Guild and the United Altar Guilds in booths adjoining our own was most fortunate. Both showed beautiful models of a proper English Altar and these together with our own made an impressive display. The St. Hilda people showed a large collection of splendid vestments and altar hangings, all of proper Anglican pattern, which supplemented our own display remarkably.

Our booth was ten feet square, open in front, and enclosed by seven-foot walls of five-ply board, pale blue in color. Inside we had three chairs, two tables of steel and dark blue leather, and a large wooden table decorated with gold colored tissue paper. The effect was inviting and handsome. An excellent sign across the back showed who we were—*The American Anglican Society*. On the yellow table at the back stood a beautiful model of an English Altar, sent by Miss Pray of Boston. The walls were decorated with photographs of English Altars in American and English Churches. An architect of the Diocese of Oxford, England, sent us fourteen large and beautiful photographs for this use; we had also photographs of the altars at Roxbury Crossing, Boston, Tiverton, R.I., and Oberlin, Ohio, and a splendid large photograph of a procession leaving the chancel of Christ Church, Bronxville, New York. In the upper corners of the wall at the back were two large placards, one reading *The Objects of this Society are*—1, *The teaching of the catholicity of the Church*; 2, *Loyalty to the Prayer Book*; the other saying, *This Society Provides a Standing-ground for Catholic-minded Churchmen who reject Extremes*. One small table contained pamphlets and leaflets for the registration of visitors, with

pen and ink and a card of invitation handy; here too were invitations to join the Society. The other small table contained pamphlets and leaflets for sale. The ends of the table at the back held literature for free distribution. Our leaflets and booklets were eagerly purchased by members of Altar Guilds, who stated that they wanted them to use in their teaching. A Massachusetts woman was insistent in obtaining the photographs of Oberlin servers, in order to show the proper form of apparelled albe and amices, the servers' tunic, and the winged rochet. They were ordered for her.

The hall was open daily from nine to seven and a constant stream of visitors passed through; these consisted of the 7,000 people connected with the convention and of numberless sightseers from Kansas City and the surrounding territory. They ranged all the way from venerable bishops to Sunday School classes and school children. A very large proportion of them stopped at our booth; over 400 registered and a great many escaped us without leaving their autographs. The registration books furnish an invaluable mailing list for future use. Our literature disappeared very rapidly and in many items we had need for a larger supply. Twenty-one memberships were taken and more were promised for the future. We were constantly busy answering questions of every possible sort—sometimes delivering little lectures on the Society and its aims. Expressions of appreciation were numberless, and words of criticism were very few. The main argument presented by our booth was the effort of the Society to bring about a closer unity, and a greater appearance of unity, within our own communion. It appealed to many people as hopeful and necessary.

Two services were held under the auspices of the Society, both at St. Mary's Church, whose Rector, Father Merrill, gave us unlimited encouragement and help. On the first Sunday afternoon we had Evensong there, with Bishop Mikell reading the service and Bishop Oldham preaching a most excellent sermon on the Society. On the following Wednesday morning at 7.30, we had a sung Eucharist, with Bishop Oldham presiding, and the choir of the Church, as well as four servers, assisting. Vestments

for priest and servers were from Christ Church, Oberlin, and the more elaborate type of ceremonial was used. The attendance was about 150, and more than 90 Communions were made. At a little breakfast which followed, many helpful suggestions were made for the conduct of similar undertakings in the future. Following this service, many people called at the booth to

express favourable comment and to ask questions about the ceremonial. The offertory procession, from a side chapel, and the gospel procession to the chancel step were especially liked and admired.

Those concerned in the undertaking feel that it was eminently worth while and that the kind publicity secured could not have been achieved in any other way.

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC: ITS HISTORY AND FORCE.

A REPRINT OF THE BOOKLET, BY LOUIS E. DANIELS, PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN BRANCH OF THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY.

The Ornaments Rubric—a thing that everybody has heard of, and a thing that most people, even clergymen, know little or nothing about. It stands on a page by itself, in the English Prayer Book, opposite the beginning of Morning Prayer—the most conspicuous place given to any rubric. It is truly the foundation and beginning of all the rubrics, since without its directions, or similar ones, the carrying on of the Prayer Book services would be impossible. It has stood in its present position since 1559, though it has often been assailed, sometimes with violence.

Now let us ask what it is. Rubrics are directions as to how the service is to be carried on. They have to do with postures, gestures, moving about the church, the habit to be worn, and innumerable other small matters involved in putting the Prayer Book services into action. Many of them call for and presuppose articles of furniture and equipment. The rubric in question has to do with the providing and placing of all of the paraphernalia of public worship as our mother Church of England plans the same. The word Ornaments, in both the title and the text of the rubric, is used in a technical sense, and it has to do with all the articles of vestments, the altar and its furniture, the font and its appointments, the choir stalls, and even the organ.

The mediæval service books, on which our English Prayer Book rests, were several in number. The services in them were sparingly provided with rubrical directions, such directions being brought together in one volume called the Consuetudinary, which prescribed the ceremonial and assigned it to the various persons concerned. With the appearance of the first Prayer Book in English these various books were brought together, and the rubrical directions were

freely scattered through the services. However, many of the things used, worn, and done were left unmentioned, custom and tradition being trusted to guide the ministers. This first Prayer Book, issued in 1549, was a simplification and coordination of the old Latin services, merely bringing them into English and freeing them from many complexities and certain superstitious accretions. The doctrines of Protestantism were not to be found in it. Three years later a revision of it was issued which changed all this by bringing in a very strong infusion of continental Protestantism. Seven years later came a third book, based on the other two, and arriving at a sort of compromise between them. In this third Prayer Book our Ornaments Rubric appears, and there it has stayed through all the vicissitudes of the succeeding years.

Let us now ask ourselves why the Ornaments Rubric was put there? What led to its composition and insertion? We shall have to take a brief glance over the history of the period in order to give an answer.

The Reformation under Henry VIII was a comparatively simple affair. The leading element of it was the getting rid of the usurped authority of the pope in England. The corruptions of the papal system, and the sack of Rome and imprisonment of the pope by the Emperor Charles V, had shaken men's confidence in the truth of papal claims. The pope was legislated out of England by Henry's parliament, and the way was open for measures of reform that had long been advocated by many of the best men in England. There was no break in the continuity of the church's ministry or doctrines, but the services were gradually brought into English, and Henry saw to it that an English Bible was placed in every church in England and kept where the

people could read it. A rubric at the beginning of the Communion Office directed that at the Communion the priest should wear a white albe, with a "vestment or cope," and that those assisting should likewise be properly vested. This was but a continuation of things as they had been from time immemorial. It is the first form of our ornaments rubric. People attending Mass in an English parish church of that day would have experienced no shock of sudden change, the chief differences to be noted being the use of the English tongue, and the administration of the Communion in both kinds. The First Prayer Book was begun under Henry VIII, and was completed during the first two years of the reign of the boy Edward VI. During the six years of the reign of this unfortunate youth the government was carried on in turn by his two uncles. The first of them, the Duke of Somerset, was probably as great a rogue as ever ruled in England. Wakeman says that his unexampled rapacity was unrelieved even by the nobler vices. He stripped the English churches of their silver and gold and embroideries, and he abolished the monasteries that he might seize their lands. He was about to pull down Westminster Abbey in order to use its materials for a palace for himself, and he was deterred only by the gift of twenty manors from the abbot. He advanced crowds of his satellites to positions in the government, granting them titles and enriching them with church lands. Of course by these tactics he was able to carry the government with him. Along with his robberies he affected a strong leaning toward the ultra-Protestantism of Germany and Geneva. He brought in a number of foreign reformers, Lutherans and Calvinists, presenting them with professorships in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. They fomented dissatisfaction with the Catholic features of the Church of England, and especially with its Prayer Book, and a drastic revision of it was begun. Says Overton :

"The dominant party in the State was quite in favour of the dominant party in the Church, being convinced not by theological arguments, but by the *argumentum ad crumenam*. The greater the simplicity, not to say bareness, of the accessories of worship, the greater would be the spoils that fell to them. Altars, with their rich adornments and vestments, were expensive, but oyster tables and Geneva cloaks were uncommonly

cheap ; so the court party were in heartfelt sympathy with the reform party."

The result of their propagandism and labours was the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI. This, while based on the first book, was an extensive departure from it. It went a considerable distance in the direction of the ultra-Protestant services of the continent, and its chief features strove to mark the elimination of evidences of the belief of the Church in the Real Presence. The manuscript was sent for criticism to Calvin himself and he groaned because the book did not go nearly far enough. If the work of the framers of this book had continued, we can have little doubt that the Church of England would have been reduced to an imitation of the continental Protestant sects.

But before the book could come into use progress in that direction was stopped by the death of Edward VI, and the succession of his sister Mary. She and her advisers lost no time in restoring the Roman regime. They threw out the reformed Prayer Books, restored the Mass in Latin, and began a cruel persecution of any who might raise a voice against it. Laws against heretics were passed and burnings began. During her brief reign of five years at least 300 persons were burnt, including five bishops and fifty women. Cranmer, whose inestimable work on the English Prayer Book has made it one of our outstanding literary gems, was one of the martyrs. A great number of the clergy fled to the continent and settled along the Rhine and in Geneva, where English congregations were set up. The Prayer Book was now to be found only among them, and the Continental reformers interfered with its use even among these exiles.

Mary's bloody reign came to an end in five years, and the masses of the English people, who had at first welcomed a release from the rapacities and hypocrisies of the Edwardian authorities, now lighted bonfires on every hilltop in celebration of the end of a bloody tyrant whom they had come to hate. Elizabeth, the third of Henry's children to reign, came to the throne amid great rejoicing. She showed from the first a spirit of moderation and conciliation which tended to draw the people together and to cement their loyalty to their own sovereign and their own Church. The First Prayer Book of Edward was from the start used in the royal chapel. She showed plainly that

she was neither Roman Catholic nor Lutheran, that she stood for the national Church of England, which had suffered such ills, first from the Edwardian Protestantizers, and then from the Marian Romanizers. She gave representation to both parties in selecting her advisers, and she adopted a policy of compromise in her efforts to hold the Church and the Nation together. But she did not have smooth sailing. The exiles came flocking back from the continent, filled with the motives and principles of the Lutherans and Calvinists; and those who, remaining in England, had felt the tyranny of the Marian regime were themselves inclined to fly to the other extreme. Elizabeth desired the restoration of the First Prayer Book, which was quite in line with her own beliefs and practices, but her new archbishop, Parker, a man of great wisdom and insight, felt that its acceptance would be impossible, and so the second Prayer Book, with certain important and significant changes, was brought in. The outstanding new features of the Elizabethan book (which dates from 1559) were the restoration of the words of administration from Edward's first book, restoring the clear allusion to the Real Presence, and the introduction of our Ornaments Rubric.

It must be evident from this brief historical survey that two sharply contrasting streams of ideal and development were at work through the Reformation period; there was the "back to Rome" movement, which had been triumphant during Mary's reign; and there was the "over to Calvin" movement, which had almost triumphed during the later years of Edward's reign. Each one was positively doctrinal in its foundations, but they both, quite naturally, worked out their doctrinal tendencies into ceremonial expression. To hold to the Latin Mass, with its concomitants of transubstantiation, veneration of relics and images, and all the rest, led to Roman ceremonial. To hold to the Continental Lord's Supper, with all its minimizings, meant the abolition of vestments, altars, set prayers, and so on. The latter threat was the more immediate one in the early days of Elizabeth; there was an epidemic of altar-smashing, accompanied by the setting up of tables outside the choir and of a chair before the chancel arch, facing the people, for the reading of the service. Vestments of course were fought against, and a general disuse of the old service forms

was striven for by the party of the extremists. Between the two extremes was the more sober party of the Church of England including the Queen and Archbishop Parker. The religious influences of Elizabeth's formative period had been those of the reign of Henry VIII, when the ideals of Colet, More, and Erasmus were the chief influences in the moderate measures of Henry and Cranmer. These ideals were formed by the study of the Greek New Testament and of the fathers of the first three centuries. They strove for a moderate reshaping of the church, without the pope and without mediaeval accretions of superstition, but a church retaining the ancient doctrines, the ancient orders, and the outward aspect which had distinguished catholicity through the ages. The Reformation had begun with these temperate and moderate ideals, and a strong party of thoughtful men had maintained them throughout the powerful cross currents of the intervening years. In the estimation of these men the Church of England was an independent, national body with a life of her own, having power to "decree rites and ceremonies," and to stand upright upon her own feet without paying deference to the wishes of Geneva or Rome. The Prayer Book of Elizabeth reasserted this position and the Ornaments Rubric which stood in its forefront is, as has been said, the interpretative clause of the Prayer Book. "It covers all the rubrics which are to follow. Through it alone can they be obeyed." It is the only direction we have as to what the priest is to wear in the services of the church. It is our only authority for the use of organs and lecterns, just as well as for crosses and candles. Obviously the Ornaments Rubric is not so negligible as many people assume to think that it is. We are all of us using some part of its provision whenever we conduct a religious service. Let us glance for a moment at its content.

1. *The Morning and Evening Prayer shall be used in the accustomed place of the Church . . .* This was of course directed against the vagaries of the Puritans in setting up a special pew or chair, facing the people, for the conduct of the service

2. *The chancels shall remain as they have done in times past.* This, again, was intended to counteract the removal of the altar with its furnishings, and the substitution for it of a cheap table (which some in

that day referred to as an oyster table) in the body of the church, round which the people were to be seated for the reception of the holy communion. These two provisions were not difficult to enforce, and they are now observed by all of us, as they have been for centuries.

3. *And here is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church, and of the minister thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.* The ornaments of the church referred to are such things as the Bible, Prayer Book, altar, chalice and paten, linens, font, bell, chair, and pulpit. All these are mentioned in the First Prayer Book; besides them we have, by implication, credence, cruets, pyx, lectern, litany desk, etc. The ornaments of the minister include, of course, the vestments ordered by the First Prayer Book,—that is to say, albe, chasuble, cope, surplice, customary habit of the bishop, and no doubt the usual vestments of choristers and acolytes. It was in the matter of the Eucharistic vestments that the greatest difficulty was experienced in securing obedience to the rubric. Those who held continental views of the Eucharistic Presence refused utterly to assume a garment which implied that Presence. Many insisted on ministering in their street clothes, or peasant's jacket, and we have record of one priest who felt that he must wear his hat during the service. The authorities made concessions, allowing the surplice to suffice, although the law was not changed. As a matter of fact the chasuble was practically disused until the Oxford Movement of a century ago brought in a new interest in the outward expression of catholic doctrines. Since that time the Eucharistic vestments have been largely restored, and they are coming more and more into use each year.

The later history of the rubric is interesting; the matter of it was attacked again and again during Elizabeth's time—indeed her whole reign was characterized by a long-drawn contest between the Puritans and the Churchmen. On the accession of James, in 1603, the Puritans at once brought to the king a petition, signed by some thousand ministers, praying to be relieved from the requirements of the Ornaments Rubric. A conference was arranged at Hampton Court for January, 1604,

at which the king listened to them in person. The request for the removal of the Ornaments Rubric was denied, and the petitioners were told to conform, or leave the ministry. At the Restoration another petition was presented and a conference was held at the Savoy Palace. The result was that the Ornaments Rubric was retained and was made a part of the civil law.

Through all these contests we see the Church of England setting up and defending her standard. The law was mandatory and it was never weakened in its terms, but it was never enforced, and in some details, especially in the matter of vestments, it was never observed. Our mother church was strong in the maintenance of her law, but she was always very tolerant toward non-conformity within her own borders. What are we to make of this? This, I think; that the Ornaments Rubric enunciates a great principle, the principle of continuity in rites and ceremonies with the church of the early ages. Her desire was never to catch and punish offenders, but always to set forth her ideals. This is true of all fundamental laws; they are expressions of ideals of conduct, not traps to catch the unwary. Our present day view of this fundamental law of our church must rest upon our loyalty to our mother church and our desire to conform ourselves to her ideals.

The question must of course be asked, does the Ornaments Rubric apply to us of the American Church? Again the answer depends upon our loyalty. The American Church has given us no substitute for this rubric; she has persistently omitted to set forth any ceremonial law, and if this rubric is not our ceremonial law, we have none. However, the church has not been quite silent on the subject; the Preface to the American book says:

“ . . . this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship.”

Certainly the Ornaments Rubric is concerned with essential points of worship.

The Ornaments Rubric was especially directed in its inception against minimizers in the matter of ceremonial, against those who objected to the ancient ceremonial, or to any ceremonial at all; there is still need within our borders for this use of it, but we invoke it to-day chiefly against those who go to excess in their ceremonial. In many parishes of our communion the services bear

little resemblance to the services of our mother church. The rites are freely subtracted from and added to, or changed in their sequence, strange ceremonies are imported from alien sources, and rites are taken over to give opportunity for their use, and the whole atmosphere is made to conform as closely as possible to the atmosphere of Rome. This is disturbing to great numbers of our own people and it tends to drive away from us many who stand inquiringly at our gates. Our church needs to re-shape itself in accordance with the pattern set by our mother church four centuries ago. Let me close with the words of a great English churchman, who stands high among the liturgical scholars of our day:

"The reunion of Christendom can never be furthered by the assimilation among ourselves of modern Roman ceremonial. For the men in the Roman Communion who are inclined to be friendly towards us are also inclined to deplore the ultramontane policy of substituting Roman customs for the ancient national customs of the rest of the West. The more we identify our practices with such details as are peculiar to modern Rome, the further we get from the usages of the East. And if we make our services identical with those of the Roman churches amongst us, we shut the door for ever to that reconciliation of the numerous non-episcopal bodies for whom we have especial responsibility."

THE ARMS OF CROMWELL.

At a moment in human history when the minds of vast numbers of men by some inexplicable perversity are turned back, like the apostle's dog and sow, to view with morbid attraction the bondage from which their fathers freed themselves, any notes on Cromwell may have a topical interest. That a man of Oliver's intellectual calibre and greatness of character—he is perhaps the only exception in history to Acton's rule that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely"—that he should have failed to set up a stable government on an authoritarian basis is proof of the weakness inherent in autocratic rule. Where Cromwell failed the Mosleys, the Mussolinis and the Hitlers cannot hope to succeed. The stars in their courses fight against them.

Memorials of the Cromwell family and their connections are to be found in many English churches, some only to be recognised as such by means of their armorial shields, the quarterings on which have been for nearly two centuries a subject of inquiry and argument among antiquaries. Noble's "Memorials of the Protectoral House of Cromwell," published in 1785, the earliest and most exhaustive attempt to elucidate them, was criticised (but exploited) by Gough in his "Genealogical View of the Family of Cromwell," and ridiculed by Carlyle as "a Book, if we must call it a Book, abounding in facts and pretended facts more than any other on this subject. Poor Noble has gone into much research of old leases, marriage contracts, deeds of sale and such like; he is learned in parish reg-

isters and genealogies, has consulted pedigrees 'measuring 8 feet by 2 feet 4 inches'; goes much upon heraldry; in fact has amassed a large heap of evidences respecting Cromwell and his Connexions; from which the reader, by his own judgement, is to extract what he can." Noble's work was far from deserving the scorn thus poured upon it, but his heraldic explorations certainly left obscurities to be cleared up by his successors. In 1861 some attempts to do so were made by various contributors to "*Notes and Queries*" (2nd Series, Vol. XI) but, for lack of an editorial summary of the evidence adduced, no definite conclusion was reached. To clear up the problem by providing such a summary is the purpose of this short paper.

Noble's drawings of shields in a window at Hinchinbrook and of the banners displayed at Oliver's funeral, Harvey Bloom's description of his signet, a brass at Great Hampden to his aunt Elizabeth Cromwell, mother of John Hampden, and the remains of a monument to her sister, Mary, wife of Sir William Dunch of Little Wittenham, "one of the most costly monuments I have seen," says Noble, but now cast out of the church and lying in fragments in a barn near by, these and other memorials show that the Cromwell shield bore quarterly the following coats:

1. Sable a lion silver.
2. Gold a lion looking backward sable.
3. Party azure and sable three fleurs de lys gold.
4. Sable three spear-heads silver (some-

times parted by a silver cheveron).

5. Sable a cheveron between three fleurs de lys silver.

6. Gules three cheverons silver.

7. Gold a lion (tincture uncertain).

8. Gold a cheveron sable with a molet silver.

The Hampden brass has 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 1. The Protector's signet, like his funeral banners, had 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Gough describes another seal bearing 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 1. The Wittenham tomb has 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8.

It is immediately obvious that these are all Welsh coats; and the first historical reference to the family, in Leland's *Itinerary* iii. 17, shows them as small landowners on the outskirts of Cardiff. Oliver's grandfather's grandfather, the son of William ap Evan, was baptised Morgan and called himself Williams: his son Richard was the first of his race to adopt the surname of his father, but he soon changed it for that of his mother, Catherine Cromwell, sister of Thomas, Earl of Essex, Malleus Monachorum, Vicar-general,* who was himself the son of Walter Smyth of Putney and the husband of a widow named Williams.

Unlike most of the Tudor upstarts Essex, though he had assumed the name of an extinct baronial house, seems to have made no claim to long descent and was content to purchase from the Heralds in 1533 the new coat of azure a fesse between three lions gold with a rose of England between two bequets (or choughs) thereon, the rose and the birds, as in the arms of his patron Wolsey, referring to his office under the Crown and to his namesake Thomas of Canterbury.† His shield with these arms quartered with his wife's remains in contemporary glass in the Bodleian Gallery. His son, however, discarded them for the presumably older coat of quarterly per fesse indented gold and azure four lions passant counterchanged, which is so near to that of

* As such, in 1538, he ordered the keeping of Parish Registers, with a view, as was believed, to a tax on the Sacraments.

† Three golden lions on an azure field were the arms of Chich. Cromwell's large properties in Essex included the manor of Chich with the estates of the Priory of St. Osyth; on account of which he selected Essex for his title. Unfortunately, nothing but their arms is known of the family of Chich, but the choice must be more than a coincidence—though the earlier earls of Essex of the Bohun family had also borne golden lions on an azure field. The difficulty in either explanation is that he got the arms before the property and the peerage.

the princes of North Wales as to suggest a Welsh ancestry.

Richard Cromwell, alias Williams, was less modest. For him the heralds, feed by his son Sir Henry of Hinchinbrook, constructed pedigrees tracing his descent from Welsh chieftains on the far side of the Norman Conquest. One of these, signed by Ralph Brooke, York Herald, was printed by Noble; another, by Randle Holme, is quoted in *Notes and Queries*, 30 Mar. 1861; a third by Vincent is cited in Burke's *General Armory*, and yet another, by a Welsh herald, is printed in Lipscomb's *Bucks I*, 66. Though all these differ in their early details it is possible by collating them to identify the persons intended by the various quarterings.

No. 1 is the coat ascribed to Owen ap Teithwal, Lord of Cardigan, whose daughter and heiress, Morfydd, married Gwyddr (or Glothian) Lord of Powys, with whom most of the pedigrees begin.* Inherited by Oliver, as their direct descendant, it became a part of the national arms and of the Great Seal of England during the Protectorate.

No. 2, the paternal arms of Glothian, were discarded by his son Gwaith Voed Vawr in favour of his mother's coat, No. 1.

No. 3 is for Ynyr, King of Gwent (Monmouthshire), whose daughter and co-heiress became the wife of Gwaith Voed Vawr.

No. 4 is identified variously as the coat of Cynvrieg Sais and of Caradoc Vreichvras, "Earl of Hereford in the 8th century"; according to Brooke's pedigree it was brought in by the daughter and co-heir of Rhun ap Sissilt.

No. 5 is identified as for Collwyn ap Tangno, Founder of the Vth Noble Tribe, but is not accounted for in any of the pedigrees. It is borne to-day by Lord Lismore and by many other Welsh families as the coat of their reputed patriarch.

No. 6, for Jestyn ap Gwrgant, Prince of Glamorgan, was brought in by the heiress of his descendant Llewelyn ap Evan.

No. 7 is ascribed by Harvey Bloom,

*In a pedigree in Burke's *History of the Commoners* iii. 386 he is said to be eleventh in descent from Teon, a royal Briton, Bishop of London, who was driven from his see by the pagon Saxons. Such imaginative efforts are due to the notion that extraordinarily successful men can have had no ordinary progenitors. It has lately produced the pedigree of a modern millionaire showing his descent from a 13th century landowner in the county where he made his money. Those in a position to do so will find it amusing to look up the references, . . . *Rot. Hund.* ii. 727.

English Seals, p. 102, to Madoc ap Meredith, Prince of Powys. According to Randle Holme he was in the direct line of descent from Gwaith Voed Vawr but varied his paternal arms to the version afterwards used as a quartering by his descendants.

No. 8, Mirfin, was brought in by the marriage of Frances, daughter and heir of Sir Thomas Mirfin, Lord Mayor of London 1518, with Richard Cromwell, alias Williams.

The last quartering represents an authentic descent; of the matches asserted by the others we know little and may suspect much. But we have to decide not the truth of the story but what characters, real or fictitious, are represented by what coats.

The arms displayed at the Protector's

funeral for his wife, Elizabeth Bouchier, were sable three leopards gold spotted sable; for his mother, Elizabeth Steward, the coat of the royal Stewarts, though the name, as was shown by *The Genealogist*, 1885, was originally Styward; for his grandmother, Joan Warren, gold a chevron between three griffins' heads razed sable. Her mother, Joan Lake, became the second wife of the Founder of St. John's College, Oxford, and her arms, a bend between six false roundels, were impaled with his above the "common-gate" of the college, the gateway, now demolished, in the wall of the forecourt.

E. A. GREENING LAMBORN.

THE DRAMA OF THE SANCTUARY.

INTRODUCTION.

These suggestions for meditations upon our Order of Holy Communion were begotten of Gogol's Meditations on the Divine Liturgy, by the difficulty of adapting those from the Russian rite to the Anglican. But, having neither the learning nor the inspiration to produce meditations of my own, I have drawn attention to certain appropriate passages in Holy Scripture, and added only enough letterpress to shew their connection with that moment of the Liturgy to which I have related them. There is therefore hardly anything left of Gogol in these notes but the idea of treating the Holy Eucharist as a dramatic sequence rather than always considering it as a whole.

It is intended that the reader should use these notes in private, reading them and looking up the references until he has material enough for a meditation, and when that is exhausted beginning again where he left off. The actual length of the scriptural passages to be read is left to his intelligence, the references being only to those verses which shew their relevance most clearly.

Since by their nature the Holy Mysteries belong first to Eternity, and only secondly to time and place, this piecemeal consideration of them will not appeal to everyone, and moreover amongst those to whom it does appeal some will think that I have arbitrarily attached certain ideas to certain moments, and that many of the texts from the Bible are ill-chosen. Nevertheless, I think anyone who wishes to look upon the Holy Sacrifice as a succession of events will find some food for thought here, and he can

expand the scheme indefinitely from his own reading and omit what does not suit him, until he has produced something that fits his own needs.

The great variety of rites used in the different provinces of our communion presented a difficulty. I have tried to shew how this type of meditation can be adapted to them all, by taking two, with the structure of which I have been familiar from boyhood, and which seem to me to represent the opposite poles of the sphere of Anglican Liturgy. The part commonly known as the Antecomunion, which ends with the Offertory—corresponding roughly with the Liturgy of the Catechumens or Ordinary of the Mass—varies but little in broad outline among us, and I have given it once (Part I). But the latter part, approximating to the Anaphora or Liturgy of the Faithful in the East and to the Canon of the Latin Mass, I have given twice. At the risk of offending Englishmen I have put the Scottish Liturgy (1929 form) first (Part II), as being the richer in material, and the more classical in form. The English Communion of 1662 comes second (Part III), and although it is undoubtedly eccentric, I hope I have shewn that it is not altogether inconsequential. It would require only a slight re-arrangement of what I have written for the Scottish Liturgy to adapt it for the Revision of 1928, and similarly selected passages from Parts II and III would fit the popular use of the Consecration and Oblation of 1662 followed by the Lord's Prayer and Communion.

These notes were compiled for my own use, but I have some hopes that they may

help somebody else to a fuller participation of that Divine Life that pulses through the Holy Liturgy.

PART I. THE ANTECOMMUNION.

The Collect of Preparation.—"Almighty God . . ." We come into God's Presence in His House upon earth, to the Altar of the Father, (Gen. xxviii, 22, Exod. xx, 24, and xxxiii, 7—10, I Kings viii, 27—29, Isaiah vi, 1—5, Ezek. xliii, 5, Matt. xxiii, 19, Heb. xiii, 10, Rev. xxi, 3, Ps. xxvi, 8, xcix, 1 and 5, cxxxviii, 2).^{*} The Throne of the Son, (Heb. iv, 15 and 16, and viii, 1), the Workshop of the Holy Spirit; (John iii, 5 and 6, Acts i, 4 and 5), and knowing our unworthiness we ask the Father, through the Son, to cleanse us by His Spirit.

Kyrie Eleison—"Lord have mercy . . ." Christ is among us (Matt. xviii, 20). The congregation represents the whole Church. The True Israel (Luke iii, 8, Gal. iii, 7) The Temple of God, (Heb. xii, 18—24, Ephes. ii, 22, I Cor. iii, 16). The Body of Christ (John xv, 5, I Cor. xii, 27). Each of us knows how often he has broken the God-given Law of that Society, and so we ask mercy of Christ, who is present here.

The Collect. The priest, as centre of the congregation's internal unity (I Tim. iii, 1, I Thess. ii, 19 and iii, 8), and, by his apostolic appointment, (II Cor. iii, 4—9, Rev. xxi, 14, Acts xiii, 2—3, and xiv, 23—26), instrument and symbol of its unity with the whole Church (Ephes. iv, 4, and 11—14), and of its obedience to Her Lord, (Titus iii, 1, Heb. xiii, 17, James iii, 1, I Peter i, 25, iv, 11, v, 1—6) gathers its prayers together.

The Epistle. The Apostles speak in Christ's Name (Matt. x, 40, Luke xxi, 15, John xiv, 26, Heb. xiii, 7), or *The Lesson* (II Tim. iii, 16).

The Holy Gospel. Standing in worship, ready for service, (Ps. i, 2, lvi, 10, cxix, 57, Matt. vii, 21, Luke x, 39), we turn towards the Book which enshrines Christ's Mind, and say to Him, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord." Christ Himself speaks by His own words and acts (Luke i, 1—3, Heb. xii, 25—26).

The Creed. "I believe . . ." We all join in the Church's answer of faith. (Heb. xiii, 15, I John iv 14, 15, I Cor. xv, 3—11).

The Sermon. We listen, not for the preacher's human imperfections but for the Gospel he is authorized to preach. (Is. xl, 9, II Tim. i, 11, 13, 14, I Thess. ii, 4. Note also

the words at the giving of the New Testament in the Making of Deacons, and the Bible in the Ordering of Priests).

The Offertory. Under the symbols of bread and wine we offer our substance, our labour, and ourselves, (I Chron. xxix, 11—14, Rom. xii, 1), in the name of all creation, (Rom. viii, 19, Rev. v, 13), for all are gifts of God (Ps. civ, 15, James i, 17).

(From the *Collection*, partly in kind, the Gifts were anciently taken, and whether it is now given to the service of the Sanctuary or of the Poor it is given to Christ (I Cor. xvi, 2, Matt. xxv, 40). The Symbols naturally represent Christ's Body and Blood (John vi, 11 and 33—35, and xv, 1), and now shew Him going to His Passion (John xii, 24, Is. lxiii, 1, Luke ix, 51, Matt. xx, 18, and xxi, 1, I Zech. ix, 9, Mal. iii, 2, Ps. xxiv, 7—10).

PART II.

THE SCOTTISH LITURGY. THE ANAPHORA.

Sursum Corda and Sanctus. "Lift up your hearts . . . Holy, Holy, Holy . . ." When we lift up our hearts to God we enter as it were into heaven (Ps. cxxxiv, 3, Is. xl, 31, Coloss. iii, 1—2, Philip. iii, 20). The rest of the action takes place in the heavenly temple, and our praises mix with those of the Angels (Is. vi, 1—3, Heb. xii, 22, Rev. iv, 8—11).

Benedictus. "Blessed is He . . ." Christ has entered heaven, and we hail Him King (Ps. xx, 9, cxviii, 25—6, Matt. xxi, 9).

The Consecration.

I. "All Glory and Thanksgiving . . ." We give thanks for historical events upon earth while keeping before our minds the eternal heavenly reality which they shew (Heb. vii, 24, xiii, 8, I Peter 20). The Father gives His Son to the World (Gen. ix, 4, Lev. xvii, 11, John iii, 16), and the Son sacrifices His Manhood to the Father (Mark xiv, 12, John x, 18, I Cor. v, 7). in worship of the Godhead (Luke xxiii, 46), and in satisfaction for the sins of the world (Luke xxiii, 34, I Cor. vi, 20, Rev. xxii, 1—2).

II. "For in the night . . ." Braving our continual betrayals (Zech. xi, 12—13 and xiii, 6, Luke ix, 44 and xxii, 21), Christ, at the Church's altar, repeatedly gives to us this eternal sacrifice of Himself in Heaven (I Cor. xi, 26), so that we may receive the benefits of His suffering, (I John i, 7), and abide in Him and He in us (John vi, 56 and xv, 4).

^{*} All references to the Psalter are according to the Prayer Book numbering.

III. (The Oblation). "Wherefore, O Lord . . ." Meanwhile we on our part repeatedly remind ourselves and one another of Him, and give thanks and plead His merits before the Father (Acts x, 39—42, I Pet. i, 8). We remember Him in His whole work of redemption—in His Suffering and Death (Heb. xii, 2), in His Rising again (Rom. i, 4 and I Pet. i, 3 and 21), in His Going up to Heaven (Rom. viii, 34, Ephes. iv, 10), in His Second coming (Rev. xxii, 20), (*cf.* Creed above).

IV. (The Invocation), "And we thine unworthy servants . . ." (E. 1928, "Hear us, O merciful Father"). It is God Himself, the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Who performs the Mystery, (Exod. xl, 33, 34, I Kings xviii, 38), by the Will of the Father (I John iv, 14), The Word of the Son (John vi, 63), and the Life-giving Power of the Spirit (Gen. i, 1—3, ii, 7, Is. lxi, 1, Luke i, 35, John iii, 8, Heb. ix, 14). We may not doubt that Christ's words are fulfilled and our prayers answered, so that the Bread and Wine attain their highest destiny and become His Holy, Living and Life-giving Body and Blood (Luke xi, 13, Matt. xxvi, 26—28, Mark xiv, 22—24, Luke xxii, 19—20, I Cor. xi, 24, 25, I John v, 6—7).

V. "And we earnestly desire . . ." In the name of the whole church, struggling or at rest, we plead in a sacrament that eternal sacrifice shown once in stark reality on Calvary (Exod. xii, 13, Rev. vii, 3, John xix, 34, I Cor. xi, 25, 26, Rev. xxii, 1).

VI. "And here we humbly offer . . ." We offer ourselves in union with Christ's Body so that our sacrifices become one with His Sacrifice (Matt. xx, 22—23, Coloss. i, 24). Our self-offering is a necessary part of the union with Him that sanctifies us (*cf.* "Offertory", above).

VII. "And although we be unworthy . . ." No offering of ours could be acceptable apart from Him (Is. lxiv, 6), nor could our unworthiness be joined to Him except by His Sacrifice (Luke xxii, 37, and xxiii, 43). Ours are included in His, and so is received upon the Heavenly Altar (Matt. xxvii, 51, Rev. viii, 4).

Prayer for the Church. "Almighty and Everliving God . . ." We do not commend ourselves alone to God. The congregation is with us, and all those dear to us, and whom we remember. And not only these; we offer ourselves for, with, and in the whole Church, throughout the earth and beyond the grave. (I Tim. ii, 1, Is. lxii, 1, and

lxiii, 9, Heb. xiii, 3, Rev. v, 9 and 10).

The Lord's Prayer. "Our Father . . ." Inspired by the Spirit we pray in union with Christ and in His words to His Father and Ours. (Matt. vi, 9—13, Ephes. v, 1—2). These words express shortly all that we intend in the Liturgy; and everyone joins in saying them, showing that we are all actors in the whole mystery.

The Breaking of the Bread, and the Pax. "The Peace of the Lord . . ." The Priest breaks the Holy Bread and gives us the Peace of the Lord, and we give it to him, for the Body of Christ is broken but not divided, it is rather the means of binding us together in peace and love. (John xiii, 1 and 34, xiv, 27, xx, 19—20, Ephes. iv, 3, I Cor. x, 17).

Invitation, Confession and Absolution. Now that it is nearly time for each of us to take the Holy Sacrament, we are reminded of our many sins, both individual and corporate, which have separated us from God. We confess them with sorrow, desire to amend, and faith in God's mercy, and receive from His herald the message of His forgiveness. (Micah vi, 3 and vii, 18—20, Ezek. xvi, 60—63, xxxvi, 21—22 and 38, Matt. vi, 14 and 15, ix, 6, xxv, 45, John xiii, 5 and 8, xx, 23, II Cor. ii, 5).

The Prayer of Humble Access. "We do not presume . . ." We creatures confess that even apart from sin we should be unworthy to come near our Creator's throne (Job xxxviii, 4, xli, 11).

The Agnus. "O Lamb of God . . ." Before approaching His Broken Body we worship the Lamb, praying especially for the peace of His Church. (Ps. cxxii, 6—7. *Cf.* also "the Breaking of Bread," above, and "Gloria" below.)

The Communion. As in Holy Baptism we were cleansed from all sin, so here our continual sinning is washed away in Christ's blood (I Pet. i, 18—19, ii, 24, John xiii, 10, Rev. vii, 14, Heb. ii, 14). As there we died to sin, so here we share Christ's life. (Rom. vi, 3—11, John vi, 27 and 54—56). As there we were born again in Him, so here we feed on His Body (John iii, 3—5, vi, 11, 14 and 35, Ephes. iv, 16). As there we were engrafted in Him, so here we take part in His self-offering (John xv, 4, Ephes. iii, 9—12 and v, 2). The whole of God's work of love, shewn in this Holy Feast, comes now in act to each communicant (Ps. cxvi, 12—13, Song i, 2 and 6), and each communicant enacts what the Church expresses in her

whole Liturgy (I Cor. x, 18, Ephes. iv, 4—7). The Body and Blood separate show Christ's Death, and meeting in our bodies they shew His Resurrection and ours (John iv, 51, vi, 50, 51, xi, 25, II Cor. iv, 11, Ephes. v, 14, Philip. iii, 21).

Thanksgiving. Still meditating on its wonder, we give thanks for the tremendous mystery just completed (Ps. cxvi, 11 and 15).

Gloria in Excelsis. "Glory be to God. . ." We give glory to God for the Incarnation, which His Sacraments extend (Luke ii, 8—16), we adore Christ who makes atonement for us, which they shew and apply (Ps. xl, 9 and 10, John i, 29, Heb. x, 5), and we praise Him upon His Heavenly Throne, which they bring very close to us on earth (Mark xvi, 19, Acts i, 9).

The Blessing. "The Blessing of God. . ." The priest, speaking in Christ's name, gives us the Peace of God (John xiv, 27, xx, 21), as we go out to war (Matt. x, 34, John iv, 35, xxi, 15—17, Phil. iv, 7). The members of Christ are not separated from Him or from one another when they leave the Church, but united in knowledge and love. The God who blesses us is almighty, and in His strength we fight (Ps. cxxxix, 6—10, Song i, 13, iii, 4, vii, 11, viii, 6, II Cor. iv, 7).

PART III.

THE ENGLISH COMMUNION.

THE ANAPHORA.

Prayer for the Church. "Almighty and Everliving God . . ." We do not commend ourselves alone to God. The congregation is with us, and all those dear to us and whom we remember. And not only these; we offer ourselves for, with and in the whole Church, throughout the earth and beyond the grave. (I Tim. ii, 1, Is. lxii, 1, and lxiii, 9, Heb. xiii, 3, Rev. v, 9 and 10).

Invitation, Confession and Absolution. Before we come to the most solemn part of the Liturgy, we are reminded of our many sins, both individual and corporate, which have separated us from God. We confess them with sorrow, desire to amend, and faith in God's mercy, and receive from His herald the message of His forgiveness (Micah vi, 3, vii, 18—20, Ezek. xvi, 60—63, xxxvi, 21—22 and 38, Matt. vi, 14, 15, ix, 6, xxv, 45, John xiii, 5 and 8, xx, 23, II Cor. ii, 5).

Sursum Corda and Sanctus. "Lift up your hearts . . . Holy, Holy, Holy." When we lift up our hearts to God we enter as it were into heaven (Ps. cxxxiv, 3, Is. xl,

31, Coloss. iii, 1—2, Philip. iii, 20). The rest of the action takes place in the heavenly temple, and our praises join with those of the Angels (Is. vi, 1—3, Heb. xii, 22, Rev. iv, 8—11).

Prayer of Humble Access. We creatures confess that even apart from sin we should be unworthy to come near to our Creator's throne. (Job xxxviii, 4, xli, 11).

The Consecration.

I. "Almighty God . . ." We commemorate historical events upon earth while keeping before our minds the eternal heavenly reality which they shew (Heb. vii, 24, and xiii, 8, I Peter i, 20). The Father gives His Son to the World, (Gen. ix, 4, Lev. xvii, 11, John iii, 16), and the Son sacrifices His Manhood to the Father (Mark xiv, 12, John x, 18, I Cor. v, 7), in worship of the Godhead (Luke xxiii, 46), and in satisfaction for the sins of the world (Luke xxiii, 34, I Cor. vi, 20, Rev. xxii, 1—2).

II, "Hear us, O merciful Father . . ." It is God Himself, the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Who performs the Mystery (Exod. xl, 33, 34, I Kings xviii, 38), by the Will of the Father (I John iv, 14), the Word of the Son (John vi, 63), and the Life-giving Power of the Spirit (Gen. i, 1—3, ii, 7, Is. lxi, 1, Luke i, 35, John iii, 8, Heb. ix, 14).

III, "Who in the same night . . ." Braving our continual betrayals (Zech. xi, 12—13, xiii, 6, Luke ix, 44, and xxii, 21). Christ, at the Church's altar repeatedly gives to us His eternal sacrifice of Himself in Heaven, (I Cor. xi, 26), so that we may receive the benefits of His suffering (I John i, 7), and abide in Him and He in us (John vi, 56, and xv, 4). We may not doubt that Christ's words are fulfilled and our prayers answered, so that the Bread and Wine attain their highest destiny, and become His Holy, Living and Lifegiving Body and Blood (Luke xi, 13, Matt. xxvi, 26—28, Mark xiv, 22—24, Luke xxii, 19—20, I Cor. xi, 24, 25, I John v, 6—7). The Body of Christ is broken but not divided, it is rather the means of binding us together in peace and love (John xiii, 1 and 34, xiv, 27, xx, 19—20, Ephes. iv, 3, I Cor. x, 17).

The Communion. As in Holy Baptism we were cleansed from all sin, so here our continual sinning is washed away in Christ's Blood (I Pet. i, 18—19, ii, 24, John xiii, 10, Rev. vii, 14, Heb. ii, 14). As there we died to sin, so here we share Christ's life (Rom. vi, 3—11, John vi, 27 and 54—56). As

there we were born again in Him, so here we feed on His Body (John iii, 3—5, vi, 11, 14 and 35, Ephes. iv, 16). As there we were engrafted in Him, so here we take part in His self-offering (John xv, 4, Ephes. iii, 9—12, and v, 2). The whole of God's work of love, shewn in this Holy Feast, comes now in act to each communicant (Ps. cxvi, 12—13, Song i, 2 and 6), and each communicant enacts what the Church expresses in her whole Liturgy (I Cor. x, 18, Ephes. iv, 4—7). The Body and Blood separate shew Christ's Death, and meeting in our bodies they shew His Resurrection and ours (John iv, 51, v, 50, 51, xi, 25, II Cor. iv, 11, Ephes. v, 14, Philip. iii, 21).

The Lord's Prayer. "Our Father . . ." Inspired by the Spirit we pray in union with Christ, and in His words, to His Father and ours (Matt. vi, 9—13, Ephes. v, 1—2), these words express shortly all that we intend in the Liturgy; and everyone joins in saying them, showing that we are all actors in the whole mystery.

Prayer of Oblation.

I. "O Lord and Heavenly Father . . ." Here we express in words our sacrifice enacted in Communion; a repeated reminder to ourselves and one another of Christ, and a thanksgiving for His merits, and pleading of them before the Father (Acts x, 39—42, I Pet. i, 8).

II. "Most humbly beseeching Thee. . ." In the name of the whole church, struggling and at rest, we plead in a sacrament that eternal sacrifice shewn once in stark reality on Calvary (Exod. xii, 13, Rev. vii, 3, John xix, 34, I Cor. xi, 25, 26, Rev. xxii, 1).

III. "And here we humbly offer." We offer ourselves in union with Christ's Body, our sacrifices one with His Sacrifice (Matt. xx, 22—23, Coloss. i, 24). Our self-offering is a necessary part of the union with Him that sanctifies us (*cf.* "Offertory," above).

IV. "And although we be unworthy. . ." No offering of ours could be acceptable apart from Him (Is. lxiv, 6), nor could our unworthiness be joined to Him except by His Sacrifice (Luke xxii, 37, and xxiii, 43). Ours are included in His, and so is received upon the Heavenly Altar (Matt. xxvii, 51, Rev. viii, 4).

The Thanksgiving. "Almighty and Everlasting . . ." Still meditating on its wonder, we give thanks for the tremendous mystery just completed (Ps. cxvi, 11 and 15).

Gloria in Excelsis. "Glory be to God. . ." We give Glory to God for the Incarnation, which His Sacraments extend (Luke ii, 8—16); We adore Christ who makes atonement for us, which they shew and apply (Ps. xl, 9 and 10, John i, 29, Heb. x, 5), and we praise Him upon His Heavenly Throne, which they bring very close to us on earth (Mark xvi, 19, Acts i, 9).

The Blessing. The priest, speaking in Christ's name, gives us the Peace of God (John xiv, 27, xx, 21), as we go out to war (Matt. x, 34, John iv, 35, xxi, 15—17, Phil. iv, 7). The members of Christ are not separated from Him or from one another when they leave the Church, but united in knowledge and love. The God who blesses us is almighty, and in His strength we fight (Ps. cxxxix, 6—10, Song i, 13, iii, 4, vii, 11, viii, 6, II Cor. iv, 7).

THE YEAR'S WORK IN THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY.

REPORT TO CHICHESTER DIOCESAN COUNCIL, OCT. 1938. E. G. P. WYATT.

I was a member of the Church Assembly for the first ten years of its existence. During that time it seemed to me that we discussed Dilapidations and Clergy Pensions every year. When I returned to the Assembly after an interval of five years, I found it still discussing Clergy Pensions in one form or another. I gathered that the clergy had shewn some infirmity of purpose over this particular measure, for I heard Lord Hugh Cecil exhort them to remember that they were shepherds and not to behave like sheep.

The mention of these two subjects brings me to the particular point which I wish to make. Some of the clergy express

a conviction that the Assembly habitually manifests a feeling of hostility towards the Clergy. I can only say that I have never seen any signs of it. But when these two measures were originally in hand, some of the clergy spoke and wrote of them as if they were designed to injure rather than to benefit the clergy, which is of course quite untrue. Again, some of them resent as hostile to the clergy the recent two or three measures designed to deal with the care of those parishes where the incumbent is a misfit. Yet everybody knows that such cases exist, and everybody knows that they do harm to the work of the Church. Surely then it is right to try to find a remedy. I

should have thought that the clergy would have been the first to welcome the attempt for the sake of the work of the Church, and for the honour of the Ministry.

Again, some of the clergy have complained of the recent measure about glebe, as being conceived in a spirit of hostility to the clergy and designed to take away their independence, and reduce them to the position of salaried officials. For my part I find it hard to estimate the exact amount of independence enjoyed by an incumbent who is dependent for most of his income on one or two farms. Sooner or later there is sure to be a vacancy in the tenancy, and even if a new tenant is secured, which is not always possible, he is pretty sure to have to accept a reduced rent, and quite sure to have to spend a considerable sum on repairs and improvements. Or take the case of an incumbent whose land is let satisfactorily ; I find it hard to believe that the relation of landlord and tenant is a satisfactory relation of a parish priest and his parishioners. Or again, there is the case of an incumbent who farms his own land : well, to be a successful farmer is a wholtime job, and to be a successful parish priest is also a wholtime job. I do not see how the two are to be co-ordinated. The irony of it all is that the clergy are themselves parting with their own glebe when they can do so profitably, and therefore I suppose sacrificing their own independence. So the measure cannot justly be stigmatized as hostile to the clergy. Another criticism which is sometimes made is that the Assembly is not really representative. I should have thought myself that it was *peculiarly* . . . representative of the Church as a whole. Whether that fact—if fact it be—is creditable to the Church or not I will not stop to inquire. Of course it is to be regretted that the lay representatives are chosen by so small a number of electors, but I do not believe that if the electors were twice or three times as many the result would be very different. But there are two serious criticisms which I have to make of the Assembly. First, that it does not stand up for the rights of the Church against encroachments and injustice at the hands

of the State. There was an instance of this at the last Session. The last of the measures to which I referred was passed in the Assembly, and went to the Ecclesiastical Committee (which is a Committee of Parliament). It was reported to the Assembly that the Ecclesiastical Committee had decided that the measures should go forward for the consideration of Parliament, but that the measures had been criticized by some members of the Committee. The fear was expressed in the Assembly that the measures might be defeated in Parliament, and therefore it was decided to withdraw them. It struck me as a lamentable exhibition of timidity and vacillation.

The other criticism which I feel I must make is this. I think that one reason why the Assembly is not so effective as it might be is that some of the members are lacking in loyalty. From time to time it has happened that one section or another—not any one section in particular—after having been defeated on a measure in the Assembly has resorted to the practice of appealing to members of Parliament to use their position in Parliament to reverse the decision of the Assembly, and so to coerce their fellow members of the Assembly and enable themselves to get their own way after all. At the last session one member told us that he and his friends had done this, and seemed to think it was a right and proper thing to do. To my mind it is quite inconsistent with any real loyalty to the Assembly of which they are members, or to the Church at large. I think it is deplorable.

I should just like to say a word about the *Praemunire* measure. The root of the matter is that the barbarous and obsolete punishment of outlawry with confiscation of property and perpetual imprisonment is preserved for one class of criminals alone : viz., for Deans and Chapters, and Archbishops who refuse to elect or consecrate a man who has been chosen by the Prime Minister to be a bishop. Such a state of things is an intolerable insult to the Church, and I cannot understand how it has been endured for so long. But some Church-people dearly love to hug their chains !

THE WARHAM GUILD

LTD.

For the making of all Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

THE REV. JOCELYN PERKINS, M.V.O., M.A., D.C.L., F.S.A., *Chairman.*

THE REV. H. ADEANE BYARD, M.A.

THE REV. E. E. DORLING, M.A., F.S.A.

FRANCIS C. EELES, O.B.E., D.Litt., F.S.A.Scot.

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF EXETER.

GEORGE KRUGER GRAY, C.B.E., F.S.A.

MRS. KNOWLES.

THE REV. E. P. LAYCOCK, A.K.C., A.R.I.B.A.

THE REV. CANON S. L. OLLARD, M.A.

SIR CHARLES R. PEERS, C.B.E., M.A., P.S.A.,

F.R.I.B.A.

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S,

THE REV. LEONARD SPILLER, M.A.

W. W. WATTS, Esq., F.S.A.

Secretary, MISS BISHOP.

Among the founders of the Guild were Dr. Percy Dearmer,
Dr. F. E. Brightman, Canon J. N. Dalton of Windsor, Canon
Cyril Hephew of Winchester, and Dr. E. Hermitage Day.

CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER,

LONDON, S.W.1

Telephone—ABBEY 4615

Workshops :

50 The Close, Norwich

Hand-wrought Altar Ornaments

Engraving

HOWARD J. BROWN
Goldsmith & Craftsman

Brasses

Church Plate Reconditioned

MOWBRAYS

for

CHURCH BOOKS

Issued by all Publishers

A. R. MOWBRAY & Co., Ltd.

28 Margaret Street, LONDON, W.1

9 High Street, OXFORD

5 Albion Place, LEEDS, 1

39 Cannon Street, BIRMINGHAM, 2

The "English Catholic" will be published in March, June, September and December for the Quarters "Spring," "Summer," "Autumn," and "Winter." Price 2/- per annum, post free.

*All enquiries with regard to the Society, should be addressed to the General Secretary :
The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.*

*All communications for the "English Catholic" should be addressed to :
The Editor, (The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT), Chadlington, Oxford.*

*Printed and published by :
A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, 18 St. Clement's Street, Oxford.*